

**REMARKS**

The Official Action of August 24, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 3-11, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled. New independent claim 11 has been added. Claims 3-11 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the specification and claim 1, Applicant has enclosed a new substitute abstract for that originally filed, drafted to eliminate the problems identified by the Examiner, and amended claim the claims to correct the antecedent problem identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the above objections have now been overcome.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 would be allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. In response, Applicant has added the features of allowable claim 2 to those of claim 1 in new independent claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 11 is now allowable along

Appln. No. 10/791,699  
Amdt. dated November 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2006

with claims 3-10 dependent therefrom, and that this application is now in condition for allowance.


The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By

  
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\O\Okpa\SCHAAP1\pto\2006-11-16 Amendment-A.doc